

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7283

1956—PTA of St. Sophia was organized. Mr. Michael Moroz was parish president.

1957—Installation of six peal chimes.

September 29: 20th anniversary.

1958—May 18: Chimes blessed. New electric wiring for church and parish home: Mr. Theodore Dowhan was president.

1959—Rev. Michael Zemlachenko takes place of transferred Reverend Stolarchuk. Boy Scouts, Troop 22 organized. Church hall redecorated, new stage curtain and window drapes installed. Altar spotlights were added.

1960—Church hall kitchen was remodeled and modernized completely.

1961—Church entrance doors replaced with bronze metal doors. M. Bilyk, president.

1962—February 18: Church doors blessed. Junior choir formed for high school age group and roof reshungled.

September 30: 25th anniversary: silver jubilee.

Cuba Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1962

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are gravely concerned about the affairs in Cuba. While Congress did adopt a joint resolution last week expressing the determination of the United States with respect to this situation, many of us realize that the resolution did not begin to offer or provide adequate remedies to the critical dangers presented by the Soviet-Cuba military buildup.

One of the most thought-provoking statements I have read concerning the congressional resolution was written by Mr. LeClair Smith, of Plattsburgh, N.Y. Mr. Smith's article appeared in the Plattsburgh Press-Republican newspaper on September 27. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call this statement to the attention of my colleagues and hope they will take the time to read it:

CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION ON CUBA CALLED INEFFECTIVE

(By LeClair Smith)

The joint resolution on the Cuban situation issued by Congress last week is a weak and ineffective instrument. It gives lip service to the Monroe Doctrine, but in accepting the occupation of Cuba, which is in violation of that historic and meaningful declaration of U.S. policy, it proclaims to the consternation of thoughtful citizens and for all the world to observe its lack of enforcement by our Munich-oriented government.

Instead, it recognizes the buildup of a Soviet satellite 90 miles from our shores and takes the position that while the Soviet has taken over the island it must not go any farther; that the launching of any further aggressiveness from that area in the Western Hemisphere will be met with "whatever means will be necessary, including the use of arms" Bravo, mes amis.

How does one account for the inertia of the present administration? How would Teddy Roosevelt have reacted under these circumstances? Don't the Congress and the President and his advisers realize that thinking people are extremely alarmed and deeply worried with the realization that the Soviet

has now established a foothold in this hemisphere? That a missile attack is now only seconds away? Can't they see that by accepting the status quo we have presented history with another Munich?

Our leaders in Washington ought to review a bit of history during the past quarter century. They might recall that in 1935 Mussolini invaded Ethiopia despite the vote of the League of Nations to impose sanctions which proved ineffective and that country was conquered by the use of air power and poisonous gas. Why wasn't Italy denied the use of the Suez Canal? They might recall that Germany commenced rearming in that year violating the Versailles Treaty and in the following year Hitler marched into the Rhineland also in violation of the Versailles Treaty. He gambled and won. They might recall that in 1938 he announced the annexation of Austria and that that was the year of the disastrous Munich pact. They might recall that that was followed in quick succession by the fall of Czechoslovakia and the splitting up of Poland by Germany and Russia. Couldn't World War II have been prevented if there had been firm leadership and farsightedness in Geneva, London, and Paris?

Our Government is pursuing the same dilatory tactics, watching creeping communism until now it has reached Cuba. It seems to me that our Government was sorely lacking in courage and intelligence to meet this brazen move. Application of the Monroe Doctrine would have nipped it in the bud. The tragedy is that it's too late. We've given them their inch; soon they will be after their mile. A firm stand at the right time instead of watching developments would have had the approval of the country. Are they mice or men in Washington?

If only we had had somebody down there who had guts enough to tell Khrushchev to keep the hell out of there and stay out, we wouldn't be faced with this dilemma. We are in a critical period of our history and I for one am concerned. Our very survival is at stake.

Now that Congress has slapped Mr. K. on the wrist, what next?

The Pomona Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is a very real privilege to me to have delivered to the office of each Member of the House a copy of "The Pomona Story," which presents the inspiring story of the plan for progress of Pomona, Calif.

The copies of "The Pomona Story" being distributed, together with a message of personal greetings, have been supplied through the good offices of the mayor of Pomona, Hon. James S. Baker. This feature on Pomona was included as a special supplement to the Los Angeles Times on September 24, 1962.

I know that each Member of the House will find this to be an interesting and informative presentation of the Pomona plan for progress, for it relates a story of how civic-minded and forward-looking citizens have made startling progress in revitalizing and beautifying their city.

Pomona is a community of 75,000 which is observing its 75th anniversary.

It is a cultural and educational center as well as a city of fine homes and commerce. It is a community with a plan and many outstanding people who have worked hard toward carrying it out.

The heart of new Pomona is the mall, a nine-block long shopping center in the heart of the business district, featuring brilliant new stores and office buildings surrounding a landscaped mall on which shoppers can stroll amid fountains and statuary. The mall was financed entirely without Government assistance and is a tribute to what can be done by private initiative and free enterprise.

Other highlights of the Pomona plan for progress are a complete transportation center, a new regional civil center, modern highways, and industrial parks.

The Pomona story represents the fruits of the dedicated efforts of many citizens and groups and Pomona can be justly proud of the nationwide attention being given to their accomplishments.

It will be noted that the message accompanying the Pomona story contains an invitation to all Members of Congress to reflect on the Pomona plan for progress in connection with discussions with constituents on problems and needs arising in their respective districts across the Nation. I should like to second that invitation, for Pomona represents an outstanding example of what the people can do in their own behalf to improve their communities and enrich their lives.

Employer of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Farkas, national president of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., at ceremonies recently held at the Wings Club, New York City, presented a scroll to John S. Woodbridge, Pan American comptroller, citing the airline's "outstanding record in the employment of paraplegics and other physically handicapped persons."

I commend to the Congress the following resolution adopted by this magnificent organization and the remarks of Mr. Woodbridge:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Pan American World Airways has consistently maintained an excellent record in the hiring of paraplegics and other physically disabled, without publicity or other exploitation; and

Whereas Pan American World Airways was the first, most prominent, and probably the only organization which sponsored a program of employing the physically disabled in other countries; and

Whereas Pan American World Airways has contributed more than any other single private organization to the rehabilitation of the disabled through its support and promotion of wheelchair sports: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Paralyzed Veterans of America, in convention herein assembled, does hereby proclaim Pan American World Airways as its "Employer of the Year" for

A7284

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 2

1962 and directs that appropriate recognition, in the form of a plaque or scroll, be extended thereto.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC.
JOHN J. FARKAS, President.
LEONARD KENNEDY,
Employment Coordinator.

ACCEPTANCE OF CITATION BY JOHN S. WOODBRIDGE, COMPTROLLER, ON BEHALF OF PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS, INC.

Having been gravely wounded while serving with the French Blue Devils in World War I, I feel considerable comradeship with the Paralyzed Veterans of America, who are here honoring Pan American Airways for what it terms an "outstanding record in the employment of paraplegics and other physically handicapped persons."

A physically handicapped person seeking employ is frequently denied this privilege in the misguided belief that since there is physical failure there must also be a mental barrier; this translates into increasing reticence on the part of the man to display his ability. Nothing could be further from the truth, as Pan American has learned from the 500 disabled working for it throughout the world.

We do not have an employment policy that tells our industrial relations people—"Go hire the physically handicapped." Nor do we have a policy that forbids such employ, there being no barrier or restraint because of physical failure if it does not conflict with the type of work sought.

There is nothing glorious in a company passionately condescending to employ a man, nothing super-Christian-like or worthy. The company is in all likelihood acquiring a relatively superior employee, one who is restless nor desirous of frequent changes of employ, but stable and prepared to do his own knitting. His economic stability still unfortunately is a factor, which should diminish and eventually disappear when this source of economic talent becomes better known throughout industry by acts and by word of mouth.

This man is not disconsolate and sorry for himself, but ready and willing to enter into the spirit of things. Some time ago, while I was watching a championship wheelchair basketball game between our Pan Am Jets and an equally colorful group of wheelchair stalwarts, a collision threw a couple of these warriors on the floor, where they continued the warfare, but in a far more personalized manner. I greeted our man next day with—"You big gorilla, I saw you fighting him all over the floor. Why didn't you kill him?" His instantaneous rejoinder, with his eyes rolling sanctimoniously upward, was—"Mr. Woodbridge, I wouldn't strike a cripple."

One hears, ad nauseum, pat phrases like "What guts." "What courage." "What will it take to live." That should all be taken for granted and one should start from there. Give this man the chance, the opportunity of employ, not stopping with superficial utterances of commiseration but translating belief in his ability into action, and we have benefited not only the man as well as our own United States of America, but, most of all, ourselves.

Peace Corps Does Fine Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article by Robert Ruark:

I MUST ADMIT PEACE CORPS HAS DONE FINE JOB

(By Robert Ruark)

I think one of the things the politicians might well leave alone is the Peace Corps. By all accounts, it's done a whale of a job.

Nobody was more dedicatedly against the Peace Corps when it was first announced than your correspondent. I smote it hip and thigh in at least a half dozen pieces.

MUCH PRAISE

There are still certain things about its burgeoning budget that might stand question. But largely, wherever I've been in the world, over the last 6 months, all I've heard is praise for the Peace Corps' solid, helpful work and generally fine projection of the best American image with the down-trods.

The Peace Corps kids have worked well at what it was announced they would accomplish—a better knowledge of the foreign lands and the natives of themselves, whilst bestowing some added know-how and inspiration to the local camel wala's and yak tenders.

STOUT JOB

Apart from a few goofs, I'd say that Sargent Shriver, who labors under the handicap of being the President's brother-in-law, has done a stout job and should be commended.

He has certainly performed a noble feat of defending his baby from the professional wolves in Congress and the ravening bears, such as myself, of the typewriter pack.

There'll be enough political throats to cut this year, and I think the Peace Corps should be let alone. It's the only thing in the Kennedy administration so far that seems to have worked.

Brezhnev Fails To Win Yugoslavs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current interest in Yugoslavia and its relationship to the Soviet bloc, I am pleased by news that President Leonid Brezhnev has apparently failed to draw Yugoslavia back into the Soviet camp.

Yugoslavia's regime of national communism, although it is distasteful and foreign to countries which embrace free enterprise, is not imperialistic and expansive like the regimes headquartered in Moscow and Peking. U.S. technical assistance to Yugoslavia has helped that country maintain its independence from Moscow. I am hopeful that even more Baltic and East European countries can be weaned away from their Soviet masters, for if we can encourage the natural trend toward nationalism in Communist nations to the point where their own nation's interest is paramount to the dictates of the Communist international conspiracy headed by the Soviet Union, we may see in our lifetime the termination of the Communist threat to freedom everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have an excellent article discuss-

sing Brezhnev's visit to Yugoslavia, written by Edward Crankshaw and printed in the Washington Post of September 30, 1962, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MISSION REBOUNDS—BREZHNEV FAILS TO WIN YUGOSLAVS

(By Edward Crankshaw)

LONDON, September 29.—The visit of President Leonid Brezhnev of the Soviet Union to Yugoslavia started off with the air of a gentle honeymoon. Nothing about communism—simply the nominal head of the Soviet Union paying a state visit to the actual head of Yugoslavia.

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev sent his greetings, but as Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., not as first Secretary of the Communist Party. The general object of the exercise was to seal the rapprochement between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union that was inaugurated by Khrushchev in 1955.

On the Russian side, the object was to persuade the Yugoslavs to align themselves more completely with Soviet foreign policies. Yugoslavia stood well with the neutralists, and where Tito went, others might go too.

On the Yugoslav side, there was the matter of Soviet assistance in the business of underpinning a very shaky economy.

The most that was expected from President Brezhnev's public utterances was a string of encouraging platitudes, invoking the might of the popular forces working for peace, not only in the Socialist camp, but also among the uncommitted nations.

YUGOSLAVS STARTLED

Instead, Brezhnev startled his Yugoslav hosts on Thursday by launching into a tirade against American militarism, against West German fascism and against the Common Market seen as the economic base for predatory imperialism. The Berlin affair was presented as a major crisis; the Cuban affair as a potential casus belli.

The Yugoslavs listened in shattered silence—and changed the subject. They need the sympathy of Western Europe and America, and are by no means in love with the Russians.

But what was Brezhnev up to in making these remarks?

The answer may be comparatively straightforward. Brezhnev, unused to speaking to foreigners, blissfully unaware of Yugoslav feelings about Russia, monumentally tactless even by Russian standards, may have been irritated by the Yugoslav Government's caginess, its reluctance to underwrite Soviet policies everywhere, and allowed himself to be needled into an indiscretion.

Perhaps he thought that if Tito was going to be difficult, he could appeal to the Yugoslav people over the head of Tito and elicit resounding applause with his remarks about Cuba and Berlin. But if he thought this, he was wrong; and he will sooner or later pay for his mistake. The damage he has done to Soviet-Yugoslav relations is severe.

Or Brezhnev might have thought that in demonstrating his solidarity with Yugoslavia, in face of bitter Chinese criticism, he had gone far enough, and that it was time to show that Moscow was by no means second to Peking in its hostility to American "imperialism." If this was so, he chose the wrong platform.

The only other explanations are that Brezhnev, on his friendship mission to Belgrade, found himself caught up in a major policy switch—or that he is pursuing a line opposed to the Khrushchev line.

PRESENT POLICY STABLE

These seem improbable. Soviet policy at the moment seems to be fairly steady. Khrushchev has been determinedly pursuing his self-appointed task of raising morale among the satellites by allowing them a good deal

moment he stepped out of his front door he entered into public life. Their system, it is true, was a bad one and eventually collapsed from its internal weakness. But the weakness was not in this idea; it was in the assumption that every man in public life must act on his own instead of delegating his authority in order to increase efficiency. The basic idea, that public life begins whenever and wherever a man encounters his neighbor, was sound then, and it remains sound today. Family life was private. The way in which a man earned his daily bread was private, as long as it was honest. But whatever a man said or did in the street or in the marketplace was assumed to have some bearing on the welfare of the city, the polis, and therefore was, as we say in English, political. In the mind of the Athenian, holding office, or supporting some candidate for office, was a very small part of politics, for his whole life was politics except when he was within the walls of his own house.

Some of you may recoil from this as a retreat from liberty. We are so accustomed to thinking of politics as nothing but formal government that the suggestion that our whole lives are political is a nightmarish suggestion. It seems to imply the intrusion of the government into everything.

But the truth is the reverse. Ours is a representative democracy. The American citizen delegates his authority to agents, and he influences their course, not by direct action, but by the pressure of public opinion. Therefore for the agents, that is to say, the government, to interfere with and try to control opinion is intolerable. It is far worse in a representative than in a direct democracy, for the right to form and express our own opinions is the sole authority that we have retained. The American should resent and resist governmental efforts to control his thoughts even more vigorously than the Athenian, because thought-control would leave the American more completely stripped of power.

I maintain, therefore, that as the American realizes that all his contacts with his fellows are, in the legal phrase, "affected with a public interest," he will be more, not less determined to preserve his freedom of thought and expression, and liberty will rest on a sounder, not a shakier, foundation.

It seems clear to me, then, that in going, as we say, from public to private life I really did not go anywhere. I was relieved of the responsibility of saying whether a convicted murderer shall suffer death, or some lesser penalty, which is, I assure you, a great relief. I lost the right to take the salute of the Maryland National Guard, but it is not, after all, a very terrible loss. I can no longer, like Louis the XIVth, "make a hundred malcontents and one ingrate" by every appointment to office, but that is, on balance, not unfavorable.

But my responsibility to the State of Maryland and to the United States is not lessened by the weight of a feather. Just as much as ever I am bound to do my best to keep informed as to the conduct of public affairs, and to judge that conduct in the light of the present day, not by the glow of the splendors of the past, nor by the wavering and fitful gleam of an uncertain future. Just as much as ever I am under a solemn obligation to support men whom I believe to be honest, and to oppose those whom I believe to be rogues.

So I revert to my original thesis. I am not here to impart information, but merely to ask you, "How private can, or should, an American citizen be in the year 1962?" I leave the question for each of you to answer according to his own situation. But I am persuaded that to the extent that you find the right answer, just to that extent you, although you may be in what is called private life, will add to the safety and the honor and the glory of the country that we love.

U.S. Cuban Performance Called "Profile in Indecision"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., September 30, 1962]

POINT OF VIEW—U.S. CUBAN PERFORMANCE CALLED "PROFILE IN INDECISION"

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

NEW YORK, September 29.—"The President feels that Cuba is a bone in his throat." So spoke one of President Kennedy's aids soon after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs.

Since then the obstruction has become a large bone of national and international contention.

How did it get stuck there in the first place? How big, how dangerous is it? Can it be dislodged short of war?

The President naturally wants to keep these awkward questions out of this fall's congressional elections. But the failure to ask them and to answer them honestly is fraught with danger to the Nation.

Castro began as a bone in the throat of the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago. Two years later, Candidate Kennedy did his eloquent best to get Mr. Nixon to strangle on it. Picking the decline of American safety and prestige as his theme, Mr. Kennedy pointed to the rise of Castro as prime evidence that "our security and our leadership are both slipping away."

His Cuban policy was to "let the Cuban people know our determination that they will some day again be free * * *," to "let Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer * * *," to "let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere * * *," and especially to "end the harassment * * * of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands."

"Thus far," Candidate Kennedy said, "these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government." And, "the way to put the ideals of the American Revolution into significance is to act on them, not to talk about them." "Hopefully," he said, "events may once again bring us an opportunity to (act) on behalf of the cause of freedom in Cuba."

Hopefully, events did bring the newly elected President this opportunity. In April 1961, President Kennedy authorized the Cuban invasion. But at the last and fateful hour he ordered withdrawal of decisive American air support, abandoning 1,400 "liberty-loving, anti-Castro fighters for freedom" to Castro's tanks, jails, and firing squads. His profile in courage suddenly turned into a profile in indecision.

At his nationally televised press conference on September 13, 1962, President Kennedy had no kind words for those who are saying today, as he himself so often did during the 1960 campaign, that the "bone" is plenty big and dangerous. "Rash talk is cheap," he said, "especially with those who do not have the responsibility (for decision)."

In 1960, addressing himself to the military aspect of the Cuban situation, Senator Kennedy said, "I think Castro is a source of maximum danger. * * * A Communist menace has been permitted to arise under our

very noses, only 90 miles from our shores * * * (Castro's) transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations * * * by jetplane, missile, or submarine * * * is an incredibly dangerous development." Thus, he warned, "the whole Western Hemisphere security system is drastically threatened."

But 2 years later, at his press conference, the President, referring again to Soviet shipments to Cuba, said that these "do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere." He strongly denied that the Communist buildup is such as "to endanger or interfere with our security," or that Cuba is "an offensive military base of significant capacity."

In view of Candidate Kennedy's profound alarm about the military threat of Cuba in 1960, what are the facts which leave the President so relatively calm today about Castro's present military capacity?

Today, Castro's Cuba, still only 90 miles off our shores, has the second strongest ground army in our hemisphere. Estimated at 400,000 men, including militia, it has received, since the failure of the invasion, over \$175 million in military aid and supplies from Communist-bloc countries. Communist-made jeeps, jets, tanks, radar and electronic equipment are almost daily arrivals in Cuban harbors. According to State Department and intelligence reports, 4,500 Russian soldiers, sailors and technicians are in Cuba helping Castro. They are training new pilots, ground crews and artillerymen.

Just last week Castro announced construction of a "fishing base" on the Cuban coast for use by the Russians. Sites for guided missiles and rockets, and bases for submarines and submarine detection are possible. Cuba will be capable of inflicting great damage on the U.S. naval installation at Guantanamo. And behind these beefed-up forces stands the military might of the U.S.S.R., openly pledged to support them, with its atomic power if necessary.

Whatever the military capacity of Cuba when Mr. Kennedy took office, it is now vastly greater.

In his September 12 press conference, Mr. Kennedy indicated that his hopes of a peaceful solution of the Castro problem lie partially in the deterioration of the Cuban political and economic situation. Dangling the prospect of a convenient collapse before this Nation's eyes, he said, "Castro (is) in trouble * * * his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed."

UNPOPULARITY UNQUESTIONED

What are the chances of a successful rebellion by Castro's disillusioned people? His unpopularity with a great section of his oppressed populace can no longer be questioned. The 1,200 captured in the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion and the thousands of political prisoners now rotting in Castro's jails certainly hate his guts.

But the unjailed remnants of the Cuban underground no longer have the means or the will to challenge the ruthless authority of Castro's Soviet-armed firing squads. Like the Hungarians before them, the Cuban people have learned the bitter lesson of resistance; that Soviet Russia will spring to the aid of Soviet dictators wherever they may be, but the United States will not always go to the aid of men fighting for their freedom.

Cuban radio and television are doing a typically crack Communist job on Cuban youth. The rising generation is being vigorously indoctrinated with antidemocratic, anti-American, and pro-Russian ideas. It is being taught to think of itself as the vanguard of the Communist liberation in our hemisphere.

President Kennedy assures the Nation that "in the last year Castro's regime has been increasingly isolated in this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear of

following in other Latin American countries."

BASE FOR SPIES

The bitter truth is that Cuba today is a far more effective base of Communist activity than it was 2 years ago. It is now a bustling, well-organized jumping-off point into all its neighboring countries for Spanish-speaking spies, provocateurs, propagandists, and secret military agents.

Radio Cuba tells their underprivileged masses throughout Latin America that their economic and political freedom depend on booting out all pro-American politicians, and elevating officials who stand ready to join the dynamic ranks of Communist republics. The United States, Radio Cuba claims, is lending billions of economic aid to its southern neighbors for one reason only: Fear of Khrushchev and Castro. American aid, it warns, will die on the vine the day Castro is defeated.

The argument is a powerful one. Probably all Latin American governments view Castro and communism at least in part as a dollar-generating program. It would explain why even pro-American leaders are reluctant to take action against him or against their own domestic Communists.

The rapidly growing forces of the Communist Left elsewhere in Latin America (especially in Haiti, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Brazil and Venezuela), and the rise of new military dictatorships in Argentina and Peru, are tragic proof that the influence of Castro has not been politically isolated. Since the failure of the invasion, there has been a massive outflow of private Latin American capital into European countries. Today, South American entrepreneurs who might otherwise be investing in domestic enterprise are sending their capital to safety abroad, with a consequent weakening of the Latin American economy and a further drain on the Alliance for Progress funds.

IN HOCK TO MOSCOW

Time is running out in Latin America, and the cold war is still being lost there.

It is hard to see why the President and his advisers have constantly failed to understand that the same ideological, political and military necessities which make it essential for the United States to maintain Berlin as a "showcase of democracy" on Russia's borders, are operating today from Moscow, to maintain Cuba as a "showcase of communism" on our shores.

Today, Castro and his country are in total hock to Moscow. If Castro should balk at this, or in any other way become a liability or nuisance, the Kremlin will quickly dispose of him, and install a handpicked successor. Unless Russian power is evicted from Cuba, it is there to stay—and to grow.

Only the Brave Deserve the Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

MR. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964-65 Corp. Mr. Moses is one of the Nation's great citizens, who has dedicated nearly 50 years of his life to public service. These remarks, expressed in his inimitable way, will be of interest to all people who anticipate attending the fair:

ONLY THE BRAVE DESERVE THE FAIR

Simple Simon is the proverbial skeptic who demands at least a sample of the world's fair. At the moment, he gets his taste largely in the form of myriad manifestations of puzzling activity, such as plowed roadways, excavations, piles of concrete, stone, steel and forms, giant machinery crawling about, spelling confusion and discomfort to the passerby, and through communications in ink, over the air, on screen and poster, by sign, symbol, and throw-away.

The Federal-State arterial work at the fair is somewhat behind schedule and drastic steps will be taken if necessary to insure completion on time. There is also danger of delay in the design, construction, and equipment of exhibits, foreign and domestic, leading to congestion and high labor and material costs in the 6 months before the fair opens. It is difficult to make exhibitors understand the flight of time and the necessity of getting shovels into the ground this fall. These are hazards of all big construction, and builders, particularly those representing foreign countries, each on its own and not subject to central direction, are peculiarly subject to them. On the other hand, our executives, whose reports follow, are tough, experienced professionals. We look to them confidently for results.

As promised, we are trying honestly and with high purpose to avoid the vulgarity, lingo, and ballyhoo of the circus and carnival and the come-ons of the conventional shills, pitchmen and barkers; but a fair can be too sublimated to attract visitors, too intellectual for all but bluestockings, too noble for the earthy and too mature to be shared with junior members of the family. It must indeed have a worthy theme and central purpose but there must also be something exciting in it for everybody.

A fair is a fair is a fair. Local or global, its function is to enlighten, stimulate, and amuse. It marks red letter days on the calendars of millions, days of eager anticipation, prolonged enjoyment, and long remembrance. In these cold war times, all world's expositions have virtually the same theme—brotherhood to be realized through parliaments, congresses, conventions, convocations, meetings, and exchanges. We continue to pursue our theme "Peace through understanding." Our symbol, the huge stainless steel globe of earth with the continents raised, with orbits to emphasize our loneliness in space and with ingenious lighting to stimulate motion, will soon make its appearance at the theme center.

We continue to emphasize that the fair especially belongs in New York in 1964, for in that year our town celebrates her 300th anniversary and descendants of the millions who have streamed through the gateway where the New Colossus lifts her lamp, will be reminded that she still sends her radiant beams across the broad Atlantic into the homes of the tired, poor, and oppressed of other lands.

In a recent interview recorded in Sports Illustrated Igor Ter-Ovanesyan, the Armenian broad jumper said:

"The 2 days at Stanford Stadium can never be forgotten. I have taken part twice in the Olympic games and I believe that I am speaking for all sportsmen when I say that this Russian-American competition embodied in itself, with particular force and expression, the Olympic ideal of friendship and honest struggle. We found ourselves equally able to be ferocious on the running track and friendly in everyday life."

We have drawn to Flushing Meadow and nearby parks in 1964 the American Olympic trials, further emphasizing our aim to create at the fair an Olympics of progress, an arena of friendly, healthy, free, international contests to which each nation, including our own, sends its best products without let or

hindrance, minus diplomacy and protocol, and in an atmosphere of sportsmanship and rivalry where only merit counts. Friendships growing out of sports are proverbial. They are vital and uninhibited, defy ancient grudges, and confound the conventional practices of diplomacy. We believe that the Olympic games rules can be applied with equal success to commerce, the industries and arts at the fair. Surely it is worth trying, since other recent international gatherings have not been eminently satisfactory.

Perhaps, we reason, this Armenian lad may have something. He may even make the broadest jump any lad has ever made over oceans thus far too wide for leaping. He may have hit upon a great truth—that brotherhood and peace may be achieved, not by parliaments, charters, debates, and visions vouchsafed to evangelists, but by youth meeting youth in honest international competition.

To be sure, ribald characters have whispered to me that it is not nobility but beer that unifies the universe and makes all the world kin, and lewd fellows of the baser sort have insinuated that the unifying impulse is the caravan, camel, and tavern yarn which is the same in every tongue and clime. There is perhaps no better evidence of Eugene O'Neill's greatness as a dramatist than his depicting the two Polos, not as great Venetian merchants in velvet robes, but as a couple of plausible drummers peddling their way east to the great Wall of China with earthy mordacious jokes and the latest about the farmer's daughter.

I would not deprive such earthy people of their little jokes. You will remember Kipling's drummer who traveled incessantly and got nothing out of it.

"For to admire an' for to see,

For to be old this world so wide

It never done no good to me

But I can't drop it if I tried."

And his counterpart described, I believe by Thoreau, who circled the globe to count the cats in Madagascar.

As obvious and inescapable a theme as ours should be exempt from controversy, but nothing is in this vale of argument. The critics tried to puncture every theme trial balloon. The symbol donated by the United States Steel Corp. was roundly denounced as insulting to the national and international intelligence, uninspired, dated, trite, corny, ridiculous and in fact lousy. Aspirational, abstract symbols offered as substitutes were cavalier to the general, wholly divorced from the vistas and surroundings of Flushing Meadow and, of course, without any accompanying evidence of financial support. The theory seemed to be that Flushing Meadow was inlaid with oil, uranium or gold. Ours is indeed a billion-dollar fair, counting all the investments in access, highways, parking, utilities, exhibit buildings and concessions, a tidy sum not be lightly increased.

Years ago Flushing Meadow was a typical Long Island tidal salt marsh. Tortuous streams flowed into it from a glacial terminal moraine. It became a big ash, garbage, and refuse dump on which that salient character, Fishhooks McCarthy, for years heaped the bed springs and offscourings of Brooklyn, under an unconscionable contract which enabled him to charge the city for short loads, and provided the scene of the most dramatic doings of Scott Fitzgerald's Great Gatsby. To establish values in condemnation, Fishhooks built the Corona golf course next to the dump, and there golf balls dropped 4 or 5 feet into subterranean hazards. Fishhooks' shards were eventually levelled and covered with a carpet of green. The old, dirty, anfractuons, meandering creek was contained and converted into a dignified stream burgeoning into what we call Meadow Lake.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7241

of those responsible for the system of reporting."

Criticism of the program has ranged from a Reader's Digest charge that jobless figures are exaggerated to provide an excuse for unneeded Federal spending to AFL-CIO complaints that the figures understate unemployment.

The 412-page report, which urges Congress to consider larger appropriations to expand the present reporting program, was hailed by President Kennedy and Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz. The latter said many of the recommendations would be implemented immediately and others given full attention.

The Committee was headed by Robert A. Gordon, University of California professor, and included Robert Dorfman, Harvard; Martin R. Gainsbrugh, National Industrial Conference Board; Albert E. Rees, University of Chicago; Stanley H. Ruttenberg, AFL-CIO, and Frederick F. Stephan, Princeton.

Cuban Crisis Proves Need of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, two of the most important subjects discussed on the House floor during the past week are foreign aid and Cuba. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House two editorials which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on September 15 and September 22, 1962.

The editorials follow:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Sept. 15, 1962]

CUBAN CRISIS PROVES NEED OF UNITY

Atlantic unity resembles the weather in one important respect, if we may paraphrase an overworked aphorism: Everybody talks about it; but nobody—at least, nobody in high authority—does anything really effective about it.

This sorry situation has been pointed up vividly by the Cuban crisis. Americans naturally are perturbed and annoyed by news that ships flying NATO-country flags have been chartered to carry personnel and materiel from Soviet Russia to help Castro build up military and industrial strength.

Some Americans go further and demand that our NATO Allies join us in an economic blockade of Cuba, barring imports from, or exports to, that troubled land—a form of trade war which, if the Russians mean half of what they say, could lead to a shooting war with prospects of mutual nuclear destruction.

Such a demand, of course, is based on lack of knowledge of the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty—and on shortness of memory where the troubles of other NATO members are concerned. The U.S. Senate ratified the North Atlantic Treaty only after specific guarantees had been given that the Alliance did not obligate the United States to defend any of its Allies' interests outside their European homelands. At committee hearings, Senators extracted assurances from the then Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, that the treaty could not be invoked to defend such colonies as British Hong Kong or French Indochina against Communist attack. A couple of years later, we called on our Allies to help defend South Korea against such an attack—but we called on them as United Nations members and not as NATO signatories.

Later, when Nasser played the same trick on Great Britain and France in the Suez that Castro would like to play on us in Panama, we not only refused to go along with our two principal NATO Allies in their attempt to regain their property. We joined Soviet Russia in voting United Nations condemnation of their action and thereby forced Anglo-French withdrawal. More recently, our State Department has accepted the Soviet and "neutralist" definition of "colonialism" and has given aid and comfort to Asian and African enemies of our NATO partners—notably two of the smaller and weaker partners, Belgium and Portugal.

With this record behind us, we cannot pre-emptorily tell our NATO Allies that it is their bounden duty to join us in throwing out the Soviet Union's pestiferous Cuban stooge, Castro. But we can take belated action to make NATO what the farsighted Charles de Gaulle long ago urged that it be made—"a global alliance," not a mere regional guarantee against aggression in Europe or North America.

Even President de Gaulle's "global alliance" would not be enough, however. The Cuban crisis has underlined the urgent need of a real Atlantic Union—a political, economic, and military coalition of the NATO countries and such other democracies as might be ready to do their share to hold the line against totalitarian aggression. Some of the same Americans who criticize our NATO Allies for exercising their "sovereign right" to trade with Cuba, would be the first to warn against endangering our own "sovereignty" by making common cause, politically, economically, as well as militarily, with other democracies.

Other Americans, clinging to the old notion of hemispheric isolation, may say that we don't want or need our European Allies in this crisis—that we can handle Cuba alone. Certainly we can handle Cuba alone—but we can't handle a nuclear war alone. No nation can.

The one sure safeguard against the setting off of a nuclear war by a "brushfire" war, in our own hemisphere or elsewhere, can be found in forming what our Founding Fathers called "a more perfect Union"—this time a union of free countries and freemen.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Sept. 22, 1962]

BLOWING HOT, COLD ON FOREIGN AID

When the House of Representatives approved a \$1.1 billion cut in the administration's foreign aid bill, it not only ignored warnings from President Kennedy and former President Truman but in large measure it also reversed actions the House itself previously had taken.

A substantial part of the foreign aid program is development loans on a long-range basis. This formerly was approved by Congress as permitting constructive planning for specific purposes rather than hit-or-miss financial assistance. Now the House has voted a 38 percent cut in development loans.

When the Alliance for Progress was proposed to aid Latin American nations willing to institute internal reforms, Congress approved it. Now the House has voted to cut \$75 million out of the \$600 million requested for the program, a move inviting Latin-American charges that the United States is running out on its proffered aid.

The House also reversed congressional action when it voted to tie the President's hands on aid to Poland and Yugoslavia. Previously it had been agreed that the President should decide policy in such matters.

The House also invaded the field of foreign policy when it voted to cut off aid from any country whose ships trade with Communist Cuba. Countries whose ships have carried goods to Cuba include Great Britain, West Germany, Italy and Greece, all mem-

bers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is possible to express regret that NATO countries should see fit to aid communism by trading with Cuba without taking action which could have serious effects on NATO unity.

House voting in those matters indicates a growing belief in Congress, and even in the administration itself, that the United States is carrying more than its share of the burden of providing help to developing countries.

For example, an administration spokesman, Undersecretary of State George Ball, had this to say at the World Bank meeting in Washington on the subject of U.S. aid to emerging new nations:

"It may be thought by some that a developing country should be able to look with confidence to a perpetual inflow of public funds to supplement its internal savings and thus feel free to discourage private investment. I think it may be said with absolute certainty that no developing country can safely make such an assumption."

And Eugene Black, retiring president of the World Bank, suggested that the need of underdeveloped nations for aid was growing at such a rate because of population increase that foreign aid from one country to another should be replaced by international aid programs.

For 15 years foreign aid has been an American policy supported by both political parties. It has proved valuable in providing checks against the spread of communism and support for free-world strength. It has had its faults—waste and administrative lapses. But if the policy itself has merit, the remedy for faults does not lie in wrecking the program's implementation of the policy dictates. Congress shouldn't blow hot and cold on matters of such importance.

In the interest of consistency and effective administration of foreign aid, it may be hoped that the Senate will favor restoration of a major part of the House cuts and will be able in conference to convince the House to accept it.

Worst Fears of Prayer Ruling Confirmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, if there were any doubt in any mind as to the ultimate result of the Supreme Court's edict prohibiting the voluntary saying of nondenominational prayers in the public schools of New York, it should be dispelled by the latest development in the case. Counsel for the New York State Education Department has ruled that not even a prayer composed by a pupil can be recited or the Bible read for spiritual purposes in any classroom.

That interpretation of the Supreme Court's ruling, Mr. President, confirms the worst fears of those of us who expressed alarm over its implications. It is clear proof that, carried to its ultimate conclusion, the decision will create a climate of enforced nonreligion in our public schools which is totally contrary to the religious heritage of our Nation.

The Washington Star pointed up this inescapable conclusion in its editorial of September 30, 1962, entitled "Religion

October 2

of Secularism." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of that editorial be printed in the Appendix of The Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RELIGION OF SECULARISM

Following the Supreme Court's school prayer decision last June Justice Tom Clark, in an unusual speech, told a San Francisco audience that all the Court had actually decided was that government shall not take part in establishment of religion. In this respect his interpretation was more narrow than those, for example, of Justice Potter Stewart, in dissent, and Justice Douglas, concurring with the majority.

Whatever the precise meaning of the decision may have been, counsel for New York's State educational department has added some interesting details in ramification. In the opinion of counsel, no prayers of any kind may now be recited aloud in a New York public school. Reading passages from the Bible, for spiritual rather than instructional purposes in the schools, is unconstitutional. A pupil's voluntary recitation in a classroom of a prayer composed by the pupil is outlawed, for such recitation would require the teacher's consent—and the teacher is a government employee. The State Education Commission of New York has already ruled against a proposal, by a local school board, that pupils be permitted to recite as a prayer the concluding stanza of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Whether Justice Clark and his brethren of the majority would agree with such interpretations of their decision is another question. But such interpretations by officials of a public school system directly affected by the decision, lend strength to a conclusion recently expressed by Cardinal Spellman: "But now there is abroad in our land a new spirit which seeks to change this religious tradition of America . . . and to commit our Government to the side of irreligion. This is the establishment of a new religion of secularism. This should be ruled unconstitutional."

The Reactions of the People of the 17th District of Michigan to a Proposed Federal Income Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, in my August newsletter, this year, I asked my constituents this question: If you were given a \$100 tax cut, spread in 12 equal installments, what would you do with the money?

I received the following answers:

Fifty-six percent: If money received in installments via more take-home pay each month due to decreased withholding, it would be absorbed into the budget for everyday expenses, gas, telephone and electric bills, medical and dental expenses, car payments, home repairs, charity, taxes (sales, property, and the new Detroit income tax), and maybe once in a while a dinner out.

Thirty-one percent: Would like the money in a lump sum or would save it and spend it in one lump sum for major expenditures such as a new car, home repairs and improvements, education and property taxes.

Thirteen percent commented on a tax cut but did not answer the specific question or were retired so would not receive a tax cut.

And I received these comments:

Twenty percent for a tax cut of which 2 percent would like it in the form of an increased exemption.

Eighteen percent for a tax cut but only if accompanied by a cut in Government spending.

Sixty-two percent against a tax cut at this time. As one replied, "Certainly the taxes are high but this is what we are paying for freedom we enjoy in this country, the price for that is not too high."

The general population characteristics of the 17th District are: Total population, 1960, 512,752; land area, 119 square miles; population per square mile, 4,308; age, 19 years and younger, 200,107; 65 years and older, 35,684. Housing, owner occupied, 126,432 or 86.8 percent. My district has the second highest percentage of owner-occupied homes in the Nation. Assessed valuation, land and buildings, \$1,093,431,295; average property taxes, \$55 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation which valuation is approximately 30 percent of the market value; school taxes range from a low of \$18 per \$1,000 to a high of \$53 per thousand.

England has successfully used her tax structure to pump money into her economy on some occasions and to control inflation on other occasions.

If the tax structure of the United States is to be used as a method of putting money into the economy to increase employment or to take money out of the economy to reduce inflation, from the answers I received to my question it is apparent to me that a great deal of work must be done to explain such a program.

Second, it is obvious to me that the taxpayer is anxious to reduce the taxes he pays at the local level, into the local communities. In a high property tax area, this tax is a most onerous burden upon a young couple attempting to rear a family and upon the retired couple living on a reduced fixed income. Possibly one of the more apparent reasons is that property taxes are not on a pay-as-you-go basis but are collected on an accumulated basis every 6 months, in a lump sum.

It was a pleasure for me to run this survey; to observe the many areas in which the money from a tax reduction would be spent and to read the answers from the very best congressional district of them all; excerpts from some of which follow:

We do have a lot of responsibility, which we are able to face only if we pay the expenses, so I do not think we should have a tax cut. It is only too bad that we are compelled to spend so much money for defense, instead of for research to improve humanity.

If a lump sum would probably be used to help buy a set of the Encyclopedia Britannica for my five grandchildren, if smaller amount to help buy them a dog.

I have no interest in hoarding money. I am proud and gratified to contribute to the health of the economy by being a spender, a purchaser, in my old age (72).

We have never heard objections to income tax, but we constantly hear concern over the U.S. unbalanced budget.

A hundred extra dollars would make it easier for us to buy a half a steer for the deep freeze.

We are an old couple and need so much medicine.

Could a drowning man use a life preserver?

I consider taxes 50 percent charity and regulate my church and charity giving accordingly.

I believe it would just tend to disappear into other forms of taxes that seem to go up continuously or new ones added.

Use it to purchase a needed item we can't squeeze out of our present budget.

I firmly believe; unpopular as it may be, that any tax cuts should first begin with corporations.

I sure would not buy booze, I don't drink.

It appears far more important to save and create jobs for American citizens than to reduce income taxes.

This mite wouldn't amount to a hill of beans as far as I am concerned.

I wish to go on record as wishing to invest a hundred dollars a year more in an intelligent, and dynamic, foreign policy.

International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Terry D. Schunk, mayor of the city of Portland, Oreg., kindly brought to my attention the fact that Jefferson High School is the second Portland high school to formalize its sister school relationship with a Japanese high school, Asahigaoka High School, of Sappora, Japan.

Sappora and Portland have close ties under the sister city program. Earlier Washington High School, of Portland, had joined with the Minami High School, of Sappora.

I am most pleased to note that Jefferson High School has joined in this program to create international understanding.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the September 14 issue of the Jeffersonian, which describes the genesis of this program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SISTER-SCHOOL TIE FORMALIZED BETWEEN JEFFERSON, ASAHIGAOKA

From our sister school in Asahigaoka, in Sapporo, Japan, has come the colorful doll which stands in the main office. It is a